

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 5, 9, 11, 13 and 14 are amended. Support for the amendments may be found, for example, in the instant specification at page 12, line 23 - page 15, line 4. No new matter is added.

In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,931,541 to Nakagawa ("Nakagawa") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,754,640 to Bozeman ("Bozeman"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended to recite, "... an image display medium, that is a sheet of paper, on which an unencrypted first image is visibly displayed on the surface of the display medium without authentication ... the image display medium includes a data supply apparatus, which stores therein encrypted data of a second image which is not visible on the surface of the display medium and authentication data used for an access authentication to the data of the second image and supplies the stored data of the second image and the stored authentication data to an external ... an image reading section for reading the displayed first image from the surface of the display medium ... a data reading section for reading the supplied data of the second image and the supplied authentication data from the data supply apparatus ... an image forming section for forming the first visible, unencrypted image and the second not visible, encrypted image when the access to the data of the second image is authenticated, and does not form the second not visible, encrypted image when authentication fails." Claims 9, 11, 13 and 14 are directed to an image display medium, an image forming apparatus, an image forming method and a computer-readable medium with similar features. Nakagawa and Bozeman, individually or in combination fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Nakagawa merely discloses video authentication procedures wherein when authentication has not succeeded, a supply of data from an image decoding circuit to a synthesization circuit is stopped. See Nakagawa, col. 5, lines 34-43. This authentication process can occur with a plurality of data. See Nakagawa Figs. 1 and 3. Therefore, Nakagawa merely discloses that when authentication does not succeed, the video information is no longer transferred and outputted. Further, the Office Action acknowledges that Nakagawa fails to disclose that the image display medium is a sheet of paper. Thus, the Office Action applies the teachings of Bozeman to address the discrepancies of Nakagawa.

Bozeman discloses "a check with a microcomputer chip imbedded within the paper surface of the check, to contain digitized signatures, security, GPS location and check registration information." See Bozeman, col. 3, lines 33-37. However, Bozeman merely discloses that the microchip can be used to store data additional to that on the face of the check. Bozeman does not disclose using data stored in the microchip in conjunction with the unencrypted, visible data on the face of the check.

However, the claimed invention uses a medium with a first unencrypted, visible image on a surface of a sheet of paper, and a second not visible, encrypted image stored in a data supply apparatus. The data supply apparatus is embedded in the sheet of paper and also stores authentication data. The image forming apparatus reads the first visible, unencrypted image and the second not visible, encrypted image data. However, the image forming apparatus only outputs the second not visible, encrypted image when it receives the proper authentication data. Therefore, the image forming apparatus prints the first visible, unencrypted image and the second not visible, encrypted image only when the image forming apparatus receives the proper authentication data. In all other cases, the image forming apparatus only prints the first visible, unencrypted image. Neither Nakagawa nor Bozeman, individually or in combination, teach or suggest such features.

For at least the reasons stated above, claim 1, 9, 11, 13 and 14 would not have been rendered obvious by Nakagawa and Bozeman. Claims 2-8, 10 and 12 variously depend from claims 1, 9 and 11 and, thus, also would not have been rendered obvious by Nakagawa and Bozeman. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Nicolas A. Brentlinger
Registration No. 62,211

JAO:NAB/kjl

Attachment:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: September 15, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--